APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,451	11/14/2006	Jim Craigie	540546-0325858 (HL-104)	1201

36183   7590   09/03/2008
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
875 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER
WRIGHT, BRYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 November 2006</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>4, 14</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 February 2006</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
       1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/24/2007</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action in response to application November 14, 2006. Claims (1-16)

are pending.

Priority

2.   Applicant's claim for benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 (a) - (d)

is acknowledged.

        The application is filed on November 14, 2006 but is a 371 case of

PCT/GB04/03541 application filed 08/16/2004 and has a foreign priority

application United Kingdom 0319363.8 filed on 08/18/2003.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 4 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 and 14 recites limitation of "**is more restrictive**". Examiner submits

such claim language renders the claim indefinite and parallels subjective

opinionating thereby not enabling one ordinary skilled in the art to clearly

understand the conciseness of such a claim limitation to render a interpretation.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bandini et al. (International Publication No. WO 03/001326 (cited from IDS) and

Bandini hereinafter).

5.   As to claim 1, Bandini teaches a **method of applying a sender-specific**

mail policy, the method comprising:

        maintaining a list of computer system users and associated sender-

specific mail policies (i.e., ...teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-15]);

        receiving a mail message intended for further transmission (i.e., ...

teaches receiving a mail message [204, 502, fig. 6(a)]), **the mail message**

indicating a sender thereof [205, fig. 6(a)];

        attempting to verify a digital signature in said mail message [fig. 8];

        if the mail message does contain a verified digital signature [810, fig.

8], **and if a user corresponding to the verified digital signature corresponds**

to the sender indicated in the mail message [810, fig. 8], **applying an**

associated sender-specific mail policy to said mail message [204, fig. 6(a)];

and if the outgoing mail message does not contain a verified digital

signature corresponding to the sender indicated in the mail message [fig.

8], **applying a default mail policy to said mail message** (i.e. ... teaches

additional policy application capability [pg. 9, lines 15-23]).

6.   As to claim 2, Bandini teaches a **method as claimed in claim 1, wherein**

the step of applying a sender- specific mail policy to said mail message

comprises determining whether the mail message complies with said

policy (i.e., ... teaches message conformity check [fig. 6(a)];

if the mail message does comply with said policy, allowing

transmission of said message [620, fig. 6(a)];

and if the mail message does not comply with said policy, applying

appropriate measures to said message [622, fig. 6(a)].

7.   As to claim 3, Bandini teaches a **method where the step of applying a**

default mail policy to said mail message comprises determining whether

the mail message complies with said policy [fig. 6(a)];

if the mail message does comply with said policy, allowing

transmission of said message [620, fig. 6(a)];

and if the mail message does not comply with said policy, applying

appropriate measures to said message [622, fig. 6(a)].

8.   As to claim 4, Bandini teaches a **method where said default mail policy is more restrictive than said sender-specific mail policy** (i.e., ... examiner submits the term "is more restrictive" renders the indefinite. As such examiner has given claim the broadest reasonable interpretation such that the teachings of Bandini, figure 6(a) teaches claims elements of different levels of policy application).

9.   As to claim 5, Bandini teaches a **method where the step of applying a default mail policy to said mail message comprises rejecting said mail message** (i.e., ... teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-22] ... further teaches a policy applicable to return to sender (i.e., **rejecting**) email [622, fig. 6(a)].

10.   As to claim 6, Bandini teaches a **method as claimed in any preceding claim claim 1, comprising receiving the mail message in a boundary agent, the mail message being intended for further transmission over an external computer network** [fig. 1].

11.   As to claim 7, Bandini teaches a **computer program product, comprising code for performing the method as claimed in claim 1** (i.e., ... teaches a program executing on a computer [pg. 6, lines 15-20]).

12.   As to claim 8, Bandini teaches a **method of applying a sender-specific**

mail policy, for use in a boundary agent of a first computer network, the

method comprising:

        (a) maintaining a list of users of said first computer network, and

sender-specific mail policies associated with said users (i.e., …teaches a

policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-15]);

        (b) receiving from a user of said first computer network a mail

message intended for further transmission over a second computer

network (i.e., … teaches receiving a mail message [204, 502, fig. 6(a)]), **the**

mail message indicating a sender thereof [204, fig. 6(a)];

        (c1) determining whether said mail message contains a digital

signature [fig. 8], **and, if so**

        (c2) attempting to verify the digital signature [fig. 8];

        and (d) **if the mail message does contain a verified digital signature,**

and if a user corresponding to the verified digital signature corresponds to

the sender indicated in the mail message, applying to said mail message a

sender-specific mail policy associated with said user [fig. 8].

13.   As to claim 9, Bandini teaches a **method as claimed in claim 8, further**

comprising: if the outgoing mail message does not contain a verified digital

signature corresponding to the sender indicated in the mail message,

applying a default mail policy to said mail message [fig. 8].

14.   As to claim 10, Bandini teaches **a local computer network, comprising:**

a plurality of user computers; and a mail server (i.e., … teaches a computer

network for which email transmittal occurs [pg. 3, lines 4-10]);

        and having a connection to a second computer network [fig. 5 [a] and

[b]], **such that outgoing mail messages can be sent from the user**

computers to destination computers connected to the second computer

network [fig. 5 [a] and [b]], **and such that incoming mail messages can be**

sent to the user computers from transmitting computers connected to the

second computer network [fig. 5 [a] and [b]], **where the mail server maintains**

a list of users of said user computers and associated sender-specific mail

policies (i.e., …teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-15]);

        where, when said mail server receives an outgoing mail message [fig.

5 [a] and [b]], **said outgoing mail message indicating a sender thereof, said**

mail server attempts to verify a digital signature in said outgoing mail

message [fig. 8];

        and if the mail message does contain a verified digital signature, and

if a user corresponding to the verified digital signature corresponds to the

sender indicated in the mail message, said mail server applies an

associated sender-specific mail policy to said mail message [fig. 8].

15.   As to claim 11, Bandini teaches a **local computer network as claimed in**

claim 10, wherein, if the outgoing mail message does not contain a verified

digital signature corresponding to the sender indicated in the mail

message [fig. 8], **said mail server applies a default mail policy to said mail message** (i.e., … teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-22] … further teaches a policy applicable to return to sender (i.e., **rejecting**) email [622, fig. 6(a)].

16.   As to claim 12, Bandini teaches a **local computer network where when said mail server determines whether the outgoing mail message complies with said sender-specific mail policy:**

if the outgoing mail message does comply with said sender-specific mail policy, said mail server allows transmission of said message [fig. 6 (a)];

and if the outgoing mail message does not comply with said sender-specific mail policy, said mail server applies appropriate measures to said message [fig. 6 (a)].

17.   As to claim 13, Bandini teaches a **local computer network where when said mail server determines whether the outgoing mail message complies with said default mail policy: if the outgoing mail message does comply with said default policy, said mail server allows transmission of said message; and if the outgoing mail message does not comply with said default policy, said mail server applies appropriate measures to said message** [fig. 6 (a)].

18.   As to claim 14, Bandini teaches a **local computer network said default mail policy is more restrictive than said sender-specific mail policy** (i.e., …

examiner submits the term "is more restrictive" renders the indefinite. As such

examiner has given claim the broadest reasonable interpretation such that the

teachings of Bandini, figure 6(a) teaches claims elements of different levels of

policy application).

19.   As to claim 15, Bandini teaches a **local computer network as claimed in**

claim 10, wherein said default mail policy is to reject said mail message

(i.e., … teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-22] ... further teaches a policy

applicable to return to sender (i.e., **rejecting**) email [622, fig. 6(a)].

20.   As to claim 16, Bandini teaches a **computer program product, for use**

on a mail server in a local computer network, said local computer network

further comprising:

   a plurality of user computers (i.e., … teaches a computer network for

which email transmittal occurs [pg. 3, lines 4-10]); **and having a connection to a**

second computer network [fig. 5 [a] and [b]], **such that outgoing mail**

messages can be sent from the user computers to destination computers

connected to the second computer network [fig. 5 [a] and [b]], **and such that**

incoming mail messages can be sent to the user computers from

transmitting computers connected to the second computer network [fig. 5

[a] and [b]], **where said computer program product causes the mail server to**

maintain a list of users of said user computers and associated sender-

specific mail policies (i.e., …teaches a policy engine [pg. 9, lines 10-15]);

where, when said mail server receives an outgoing mail message [fig.

5 [a] and [b]], **said outgoing mail message indicating a sender thereof** [fig. 5

[a] and [b]], **said computer program product causes said mail server to**

attempt to verify a digital signature in said outgoing mail message [fig. 8];

and if the mail message does contain a verified digital signature [fig.

8], **and if a user corresponding to the verified digital signature corresponds**

to the sender indicated in the mail message [fig. 8], **said computer program**

product causes said mail server to apply an associated sender-specific

mail policy to said mail message [pg. 9, lines 10-22].

Prior Art Made of Record

21.　　The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

　　　　a.　　Gross et al. (US Patent No. 5,555,346) Event-driven rule-based

messaging system.

Contact Information

　　　　Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is

(571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm

Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, AYAZ Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/
Examiner, Art Unit 2131
/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131